Info-ParaNet Newsletters Volume I Number 321

Saturday, October 27th 1990

Today's Topics:

Belgium
Belgium UFO
Ed's Video
Krill
The Salisberrys
Re: Ed's Video
The Salisberrys
MUFON
Reprint of letter
HARD COPY/BEL. UFO
Re: HARD COPY/BEL. UFO
Re: Reprint Of Letter
ParaNet Zeti Ret.

From: Michael.Corbin@f110.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: Belgium
Date: 26 Oct 90 03:21:00 GMT

Just watched the UFO story from Belgium on Hard Copy. I must say that I was very impressed with the quality of the report and the way that it was handled by the producers of Hard Copy.

This case seems to have all the affirmative signs of authenticity. It has several eyewitnesses with correlated radar trackings, and it contains a high level of strangeness considering the data already collected on it, including several films made of the object with a daylight film containing fairly clear pictures of the object hovering.

So far, the information that has been released is that it has been observed to be traveling at speeds as low as 15 miles per hour and sudden acceleration up to twice the speed of sound, approximately 1500 mph. The g force has been placed at 40 during some of its accelerations -- many times more than a human being could withstand. It has also been observed emitting a reddish-glow. It appears that there may two different type objects involved -- the daylight film clearly shows a round object which appears to have a hole in the center, or at least an impression of some sort, and what appears to be two notches in its circumference. During slow motion of the video, it appears that the notch in the bottom is moving around the object while the one at the top remains still. It is not possible to determine if we are looking at the bottom of the object or the side of it. The other reports detail a triangular-shaped aircraft that has three lights with "a bunch of yellow stars," reports one eyewitness who got a real close-up look at the object

as it flew over her house.

The Belgian military and government is so concerned about this matter that they are launching a formal investigation. The military has dispatched American-made F-16s to chase the object, however the pilots have reported making contact with it, but are unable to keep up with it. It has been recorded on radar to display remarkable maneuvers that are beyond normal explanation.

ParaNet is attempting to open up an electronic link to the University in Belgium where study is being conducted. We will keep you posted on the progress of this. It is our desire to get a link there via our UUCP feed. Anyone getting information on this as it becomes available is encouraged to post it.

Mike

--
Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f110.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Don.Ecker@f22.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Don Ecker)
Subject: Belgium UFO
Date: 26 Oct 90 06:16:00 GMT

To all ParaNet Users;

In reference to the Hard Copy segment on the Belgium UFO sightings, Hard Copy interviewed Vicki Cooper (Co-Publish of UFO Magazine) and myself on 10/24/90. They wished to get our reactions on the Belgium footage, that has never been observed in the United States. During the course of the viewing, I observed the witnesses that were interviewed, and although they were speaking French, the producer had furnished us with a transcript in English. The witnesses were to a person, highly disturbed by what they had witnessed, and none believed that what was seen was of a terrestial nature. We were able to watch the entire tape that Hard Copy had been furnished, and the photo's and video tape were amazing. During one segment, a close up of one of the night-time objects was projected, and in slow motion, I was able to see what appeared to be a series of "spokes" or "struts" that appeared to connect the lights. It was most unusual to say the least. The photo of the "disk" was the one object that I felt demonstrated the "highest strangest" of all the objects. I genuinely felt unease while watching that.

Prior to this segment, I felt there was a great possibility that these objects "could" have been U. S. experimental craft, along

the lines of Tony Gonsalves B-2 Bomber hypotheses, but after watching the clips, not to mention what these objects were capable of doing, such as making approx. 40 G dives, and outrunning the Belgium F-16 fighter aircraft, I am not quite as sure. High Strangeness* * * * indeed!

Don

--
Don Ecker - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Don.Ecker@f22.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Ed's Video
Date: 25 Oct 90 18:45:01 GMT

MC> Just a thought -- $10000.00 is a mere paltry investment on

True. But a fairly high knowledge is required, which means at least one more person who knows. Plus, it's certainly not a sure thing.

MC> And, how could X-rays be used to fake photographs,
MC> if at all?

X-rays? Where'd you get that?

Well, lessee. X-rays will fog ordinary film, or could be used to form an image in exactly the same way visible light would form an image. With ordinary film, the X-ray source would have to be rather strong, since ordinary film wouldn't be especially sensitive to X-ray.

A big bugaboo you'd run into if you were trying to form an image with a camera in the X-ray wavelengths is that the common camera optics wouldn't focus the image very well. The usual X-ray machines, such as your dentist uses, for all practical purposes makes a contact image. No optics are involved.

It's certainly possible to use optics, but huge bucks would probably be involved. Low demand so high per-unit costs.

I know an optical engineer so I'll bounce the question off him.

My opinion is that the use of X-rays in trying to fake a photo would be a royal PITA with no particular advantage. I seriously doubt you could bring visible light and X-rays to a common focus on film.

If I wanted to use a relatively invisible light to make an image without witnesses being the wiser, I'd look at UV or IR. Again, the sources would have to be fairly strong.

jbh

--

John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: Krill
Date: 25 Oct 90 18:46:02 GMT

MC> If I am not mistaken, it was from John's own lips on George
MC> Knapp's "Cooper" scooper.

That seems to ring a bell. Thanks.

jbh

--
John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG (John Hicks)
Subject: The Salisberrys
Date: 25 Oct 90 18:51:03 GMT

MC> With this in mind, what is his report on the whole subject?

That's just the problem right now. Since this is a MUFON investigation, we won't really know until Walt releases the report. It's up to the rest of us to make sure the report, if it's opposed to Walt's position, isn't just buried.
Rex is holding his info very closely and waiting for Walt to release the report.

jbh

--
John Hicks - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: John.Hicks@f29.n363.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Jim.Delton@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Jim Delton)
Subject: Re: Ed's Video
Date: 26 Oct 90 07:32:00 GMT

In regard to the relatively little movement (only a few scan lines) of the UFO, you still haven't really commented on how you would reconcile the supposed authenticity of the video with the extreme difficulty of holding a camera so steady, esp when any normal person would be very excited at taking a photo of a UFO. I'm just looking at it from the two perspectives of it either being authentic or a staged hoax. If it was authentic it would seem vitually an impossiblity that ED managed to take a video with such a steady hand. However, if it was hoaxed by setting up a model on a stick (or whatever) and the camera on a tripod, the "stick" could be held against the ground and moved side to side and back to back to produce the allusion of slight movement of a distant object and the movement recorded on the tape would only cover a few scan lines.

--
Jim Delton - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Jim.Delton@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Michael.Corbin@f110.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: The Salisberrys
Date: 26 Oct 90 07:44:00 GMT

> That's just the problem right now. Since this is a MUFON
> investigation, we won't really know until Walt releases the
> report. It's up to the rest of us to make sure the report,
> if it's opposed to Walt's position, isn't just buried.
> Rex is holding his info very closely and waiting for Walt
> to release the report.

Well, considering the past performance of his highness, Mr. International Director, that could be a bloody battle. I often wonder just how many more of those mass schisms can occur before Walt is left with just himself and his dog <g>.

Thanks for the info, John.

Mike

--
Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:207/109

UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f110.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Michael.Corbin@f110.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: MUFON
Date: 26 Oct 90 07:58:00 GMT

I talked over the telephone with Walt Andrus the other day and was less than surprised at his current attitude over the situation in Gulf Breeze. It appears that he is facing another exodus en masse from his rank and file over his insistency in backing up Gulf Breeze. It was truly refreshing to talk with Rex Salisbury as I realized that MUFON's reputation hinges on people like Rex and Carol pulling for them.

However, what will be left should the Salisbury's be "removed" as have all of the other credible researchers who were previously involved in MUFON?

It appears certain that MUFON has gone down in flames as the once highly respected UFO investigative organization. But, as all good things must come to a close, MUFON has given way to a host of pseudo-scientific, new-agey-type philosophies and leadership destined to destroy whatever credibility might be left. Could this be a replay of the good old NICAP days? As you may recall, NICAP, once a strong, solid organization was brought down by the infiltration of its leadership by government types who ravaged its credibility until it was eventually so weak that no one could begin to take it seriously.

Nevertheless, the handwriting is on the wall and it will be interesting to see how successfully ufology will be able to spring back from this most unfortunate assault.

Mike

--
Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f110.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Michael.Corbin@f110.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Michael Corbin)
Subject: Reprint of letter
Date: 26 Oct 90 08:14:00 GMT

I thought that this letter from Marge Christensen was appropriate for reprinting.

MUFON, 1990 - An Organization At Risk

by Marge Christensen

The Gulf Breeze case has recently come crashing down around the investigators and proponents of the case, and when the aftershocks cease and all of the pieces settle, there is a good chance that many of the fragments will have MUFON written on them. For the past three years, this case has torn Ufologists and UFO organizations apart, and it is likely that the damage will not be repaired in the near future, if ever. Can MUFON survive this crisis and salvage any semblance of credibility or is this the beginning of the end for MUFON?

Let's examine the facts. In May, 1988, Walt Andrus stated (concerning the Gulf Breeze case) in the MUFON UFO JOURNAL, "...if the investigation discloses that a hoax has been perpetrated upon the UFO community, MUFON will be the first to acknowledge and announce this revelation."
Then, in the August, 1988 MUFON UFO JOURNAL, Walt Andrus announced that it was no longer necessary to preface the Gulf Breeze Case with a disclaimer that it is either one of the most incredible cases in UFO history or a fantastically orchestrated hoax. Andrus concluded, "The overwhelming evidence is in. Gulf Breeze is indeed one of the most incredible cases in modern UFO history." He further commented, "Gulf Breeze is a solid case and you read it first in the MUFON UFO JOURNAL."

At that time, in response to statements such as those quoted above, various persons in MUFON leadership positions, including this author, spoke out and called for a much more cautious and objective stand on the part of MUFON in regard to the Gulf Breeze case, at least until all of the evidence was in. In the December, 1988 issue of the MUFON UFO Journal, Richard Hall warned that Walt Andrus, Budd Hopkins, and Bruce Maccabee had apparently already had their minds made up and were helping Ed Walters to write a book. Hall pointed out, rightly so, that their approach "departs drastically from long-established scientific procedure (including published MUFON procedure)."

At that time, I voiced similar objections to both Walt Andrus and Don Ware to no avail. Both of them responded that they felt that these sightings were proof of extraterrestrial visitation. They accused me of being too conservative, and Walt Andrus then announced the appointment of a new Director of Public Relations to replace me.

Even more damaging comments are found in Ed and Frances Walters' book, THE GULF BREEZE SIGHTINGS, published this year by William Morrow & Co., Inc. In the chapter, "Investigation and Photo

Analysis," Dr. Bruce Maccabee, optical physicist, writes: "Having studied these sightings `every which way' for more than a year I have concluded that they are proof of the existence of UFOs." Dr. Maccabee adds that UFO sightings have been reported for over 40 years but have been ignored or publicly disputed because of a lack of thoroughly convincing proof that UFOs are actually flying in our skies. Now, he adds, "that proof is here."

In Appendix 3 of the book, Walt Andrus speculates on the solution to the UFO enigma occurring in Gulf Breeze and paints a possible scenario that might be unfolding. That scenario includes Ed Walters, "successful businessman and civic citizen was probably selected for the ultimate disclosure so that the events and evidence would be thoroughly investigated and hopefully accepted by the scientific community as factual and not easily ignored as an obvious hoax."

Perhaps the most farfetched claim of all, though, is that of Donald Ware, MUFON State Director for Florida and Eastern States Director for MUFON. Ware's position statement on the Gulf Breeze sightings, published in Appendix 3 of Walters' book, reads as follows: "I am convinced that these sightings are proof of alien visitation. The level of technology demonstrated indicates they can come and go at will and can reside in a variety of places: the bottoms of our oceans, inside major high-altitude ice fields, in earth orbit, on the moon, on Mars, etc..."
Ware adds that the feels that the UFOs deliberately allowed Ed to have 18 photographic sessions because the aliens want people to see the photographs.

Clearly the statements above are not based on any scientific principles and are in direct contradiction to the MUFON policy page included in each year's MUFON UFO Symposium Proceedings. This policy page states that MUFON is "an international scientific organization composed of people seriously interested in studying and researching the UFO phenomenon..." It goes on to hail the MUFON Board of Consultants which is comprised mostly of PhDs and MDs in a wide variety of areas of expertise. It continues, "In order that only qualified, competent and sincere people may become involved, membership in MUFON is by invitation only."

The statements of persons discussed above make a mockery of published MUFON policy and of all that MUFON claims to stand for. Furthermore, in light of the recent revelations regarding the hoax behind the Gulf Breeze case, the implications of these three individuals' statements are even more damaging to the credibility of the MUFON organization.

In my opinion, it is bad enough that trained investigators, including a respected optical physicist and photoanalysis expert, and a former USAF Col. were totally deceived by a con-man such as Ed Walters. However, it is worse yet that these same trained investigators rushed to judgement and made such rash claims not

only publicly, but in print. Moreover, these statements were made by these persons not merely as individuals, but as MUFON officers and investigators. Is this serious, scientific investigative methodology? Hardly. Furthermore, making these statements as MUFON representatives is a direct violation of the MUFON public information policy guidelines.

In short, _the party's over and it's time for the charade to end._

Let's face the facts. MUFON is _not_ a serious, scientific research organization. Rather it has become nothing but a pop club for people with the mutual interest in reading good stories about UFO cases.

In my opinion, it will not be possible for MUFON to be in reality a serious, scientific research organization unless there is new leadership of the organization. Since that appears to be extremely unlikely, I see no alternative but to resign from the MUFON Board of Directors and to resign the post of Director of Public Education at this time.

Interestingly, at the 1988 MUFON Symposium at the University of Nebraska, in my paper, entitled "Hynek's Last Wish for Ufology," I suggested that the goal for ufologists to strive for in 1988 should be _professionalism_. I pointed out that the major UFO organizations do have established statements of values, standards, goals and objectives, but in many cases, the membership does not take them seriously. I further added that it isn't enough to pay lip service to these statements or to make the organizations appear scientific and professional on paper. We must make that commitment to put those statements and values into action in our work in the UFO field.

Although I received a great deal of positive feedback on my paper from those in attendance, it is obvious that while MUFON leaders approved of the talk, to them it was just that -- talk. Unfortunately, there was no real commitment of action to back up the philosophy expressed in that paper.

A highly respected colleague recently commented that MUFON is much more than these few individuals who have been acting in an unscientific manner. There are many people who are doing good work for us. The question now is: Are there enough good people in the organization to put MUFON back on course to renewed credibility and continued existence?

--
Michael Corbin - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Michael.Corbin@f110.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Frank.Cox@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Frank Cox)
Subject: HARD COPY/BEL. UFO
Date: 26 Oct 90 18:15:00 GMT

Just saw the Hard Copy report on the UFOs over Belgium and must agree with others here about the even handed reporting of the events by that organization. Not too sensational, but yet they did cover the events as thouroughly as television time would allow. I was most impressed by the fact that the Belgian military was so open and up front about the entire affair. Now if someone would convince the US military that with holding information is going to cause much more serious problems in the long run and full disclosure is the only reasonable, decent and perhaps intellegent thing to do!! When it finally does come out, public confidence in government will be non existant anyway. With the mess in DC now, what else can they do?
--
Frank Cox - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Frank.Cox@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Don.Sudduth@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Don Sudduth)
Subject: Re: HARD COPY/BEL. UFO
Date: 26 Oct 90 21:22:00 GMT

I was not very impressed, however, by the videos of the UFOs on HARD COPY. The first one looked very much like a distant light out of focus. The second one showed only three lights in a triangle pattern with no visible fore or background features. The reporting was pretty good (including the short interview with Vicki Cooper and Don Ecker). Not much air time, though.
--
Don Sudduth - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Don.Sudduth@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Don.Sudduth@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Don Sudduth)
Subject: Re: Reprint Of Letter
Date: 26 Oct 90 21:25:00 GMT

Ouch! She's right, however. MUFON needs help!
--

Don Sudduth - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Don.Sudduth@f320.n207.z1.FIDONET.ORG

From: Don.Ecker@f22.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG (Don Ecker)
Subject: ParaNet Zeti Ret.
Date: 27 Oct 90 19:39:00 GMT

To All:

I just spoke to Jim Speiser and found out he had some tech.
problems that caused Jim to go off line. However, ParaNet Zeti
Ret. aka <Swamp Gas> will be up and running on Monday, October
29th.

FYI---Grin

Don

--
Don Ecker - via FidoNet node 1:207/109
UUCP: !scicom!paranet!User_Name
INTERNET: Don.Ecker@f22.n30163.z1.FIDONET.ORG

********To have your comments in the next issue, send electronic mail to********
'infopara' at the following address:

UUCP	{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara
DOMAIN	infopara@scicom.alphacdc.com
ADMIN Address	infopara-request@scicom.alphacdc.com
	{ncar,isis,boulder}!scicom!infopara-request

**********The**End**of**Info-ParaNet**Newsletter**********